



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

traditions of Eton. Had he lived and persevered in authorship, it is not unreasonable to suppose that he would have added lustre to his century.

The members of the Quadruple Alliance form a most interesting group. Every one of the four achieved some distinction. Even Ashton became a Cambridge D.D., a preacher at Lincoln's Inn, the author of a respectable volume of sermons, and the subject of portraits by Eckhardt, Gainsborough, and Sir Joshua Reynolds. Gray's slender volume of verse places him among the greatest poets of his time; and Walpole is well known in many lines. It is melancholy to observe that the Quadruple Alliance went the way of all the earth. West passed out of the lives of the group in 1742, the year in which the *Elegy* was probably begun. Ashton had already, in 1741, become estranged from Gray; and Walpole, after some disagreeable experiences, finally broke with Ashton in 1750. The friendship of Gray and Walpole, however, though interrupted for four years (1741-5), continued throughout Gray's life, to the lasting credit of both men; and to the end of his own long career Walpole never ceased to express due admiration for his more learned and more distinguished friend, the poet of the *Elegy*.

CLARK S. NORTHUP.

Cornell University.

THOMAS WARTON AND THE HISTORICAL POINT OF VIEW IN CRITICISM

The avowed purpose of Miss Rinaker's monograph on Thomas Warton¹ is "to estimate the intrinsic and historical importance" of the eighteenth century poet, scholar, and critic. "To this end," the author says in her preface, "it discusses the relation of all his work—his poetry, his criticism, his history of English poetry, his various antiquarian works—to the literary movements of his day." Miss Rinaker has found it impossible to make important additions to existing knowledge of Warton's life but she has used to good purpose sixty-two hitherto unnoticed letters found in the British Museum, the Bodleian, and the Harvard College libraries, as well as some interesting and valuable manuscript notes taken down by Warton on his antiquarian journeys through England. Another welcome feature of the study is the carefully drawn bibliography of sources for the *History of English Poetry*, compiled "both as an evidence of Warton's industry and erudition and as an interesting list of the books on such a subject available to a scholar of that period." The value of the monograph lies in these things,

¹ *Thomas Warton, A Biographical and Critical Study*, by Clarissa Rinaker. University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. II, no. 1. February, 1916.

for which every student of the eighteenth century should be grateful, rather than in Miss Rinaker's estimate of Warton's intrinsic and historical importance.

As a commentary on Warton's life and work, the book is marred by insufficient critical detachment. The writer is too deeply and irrevocably given to romantic modes of thought and feeling, too nearly oblivious of all that may be or has been said on the other side, to provide an adequate criticism of a man whose writing shows pretty constantly a divided mind, an English love of compromise, a desire to keep the balance true. Warton's activity fell at a time when the out-going and in-coming tides of literary tendency were struggling for mastery. The struggle is seen in the lives and work of individuals as well as in English literature at large and is as evident in Young, in Gray, in Mason, as it is in Warton.

When the tide set strongly for romantic shores, Warton came to be regarded as predominantly, almost exclusively, romantic. An age, like the untrained individual reader, finds in a writer what it wants to find, but scholarly criticism should estimate Warton for what he actually was, not for what, so to speak, he has become. Miss Rinaker views Warton through romantic spectacles; she has the early nineteenth century contempt for "the rules," for "decorum," for judgment as opposed to imagination. Therefore she does not accept Warton's frequent pronouncements in favor of these things as genuine but explains them as due to his desire to win sympathy for his new views, even at the cost of granting the validity of the old. (See p. 44) But John Hughes, who, in an edition of Spenser thirty-nine years earlier than Warton's *Observations on the Faerie Queene*, had made precisely the same argument for Spenser's poem, as belonging to a new genre; for which Warton is commended, is put down as a "pseudo-classic" and so disposed of as a rival. (p. 42) This rather severe treatment of Hughes, whose poems, essays and plays entitle him to kindlier consideration from a romantic critic, illustrates a second phase of Miss Rinaker's critical attitude. Thomas Warton is to her, in a double sense, a sort of romantic hero, to be vindicated against all comers. Some of his natural enemies she finds among recent scholars who have entered into Warton's labor, but have "unjustly scorned its superficiality or inexactness" (p. 48). One would have said that Warton's reputation is high among reputable scholars and it seems unfortunate that no names are given to substantiate this charge. Others who stand between Warton and his deserts are those who have found fault with his work in matters of detail. The chief offender among these is, of course, Joseph Ritson—not a pleasant person, certainly, but one of a sort that will always be indispensable as long as scholarship retains any attractions for men so easy-going as Thomas Warton. The one hundred and sixteen charges of

error made by Ritson against the *History* are considered "certainly a very small number to be gleaned from three quarto volumes" (p. 115). Where it is necessary to admit that Warton was at fault, as in the case of his appropriation of three notes from Fawkes's edition of Douglas, Miss Rinaker lays the onus of blame upon Ritson, who had already so much to bear, for his acrimony in pointing out the matter rather than upon Warton for dishonesty or blamable negligence. All other charges of literary theft that have been brought against Warton are similarly disposed of, often with skill.

Warton's neglect of his duties as clergyman, his pluralism and enjoyment of fat livings while giving his life to almost anything but the church are glossed over by citations that go to show that he was after all a good fellow (p. 16). The historical method is helpful here, for what Warton did nearly all other clergymen of his time did. *Tout comprendre, c'est tout pardonner*. Even in her admissions of shortcomings in Warton, Miss Rinaker often does him what most readers will be likely to think more than justice, as, for example, where she says, "As far as we can judge from the poetry which Warton wrote, excellent as some of it is, his was not a great poetical genius" (p. 35). This is so very true that the words "great" and "genius" seem oddly out of place. The admission that he had not a *great* poetic genius seems to leave room for the implication that he had poetic genius of some sort. Miss Rinaker seems to imply the existence of some criterion of a man's poetical genius aside from the poetry which he actually writes, but she does not say what it is. The impression is left that Warton failed to write great poetry because of an uncongenial environment. Aside from the fact that the conditions of Warton's life were about as nearly ideal as one can imagine, this plea is always the mere sentimentality of hero-worship. There is no evidence that Warton did not write all the poetry there was in him, as Gray did, as every man does. He may have been an inglorious but he certainly was not a mute Milton.

The clearest illustration of Miss Rinaker's *parti pris* is seen in her repeated claims for Warton as an originator. Similar claims have been made before, largely because for a long time Warton was the earliest eighteenth century critic and poet with any marked romantic tendencies who was familiar to students. Professor Courthope refers to him as "perhaps the earliest pioneer of the Romantic Revival." (*Life in Poetry: Law in Taste*, p. 6) Elsewhere he speaks of him as the first to show an interest in the theme of solitude, which had in reality been a commonplace in poetry since Petrarch's *De Vita Solitaria* and which Petrarch himself drew from the ancient world. These remarks shed less light upon Warton than upon the condition of English scholarship when they were written, but the time for such things is past. The

assertion that any man, except Adam, has done anything for the first time is always hazardous.

Miss Rinaker says that Warton was the first sincere admirer of Gothic architecture in the eighteenth century, making light of the rival claim of Horace Walpole by asserting, with truth, that his study of the Gothic was largely a pose and a fad. But the fact is, as we might expect, that neither of these men was the first. Dr. R. D. Havens, in his article on *Romantic Aspects of the Age of Pope* (Publ. Mod. Lang. Assoc., XXVII, 3), gives several unquestionable and much earlier instances. Again, Miss Rinaker says that Warton "first described the progressive development of poetry, the essential unity of the whole, the relation of part to part and to the whole" (p. 124). Francesco Quadrio's *Storia e Ragione d'Ogni Poesia*, 1741-52, is earlier, more extensive in scope, better constructed.

Credit is not always given where credit is due. A minor instance of this neglect is seen on p. 94, where Miss Rinaker quotes from Warton's *History* a sentence on "original genius." This sentence is quoted, apparently, as evidence of Warton's "revolt against the classical age." There is not a shade of meaning in the sentence that had not been expressed on page after page of Young's *Conjectures on Original Composition*, nineteen years before. Warton must have known several still earlier expressions of the same sort. Even Giraldis Cintio praises Ariosto for having more original genius than art—"più della natura che dell' arte."

But by far the most important assertion of Warton's originality is that to the effect that he was the founder of the historical method in criticism. This assertion is repeated over and again, twice with an attempt at qualification, usually without hesitation, as, for example: "He [Warton] produced a revolution in criticism"; "He substituted untried avenues of approach"; he became the "founder of a new kind of criticism"; "he introduced the modern historical method of criticism" (all on p. 43); he laid "the foundations of modern historical criticism" (p. 47). Again it is said that "no critic before Warton had realized the importance of supplementing an absolute by an historical criticism, of reconstructing, so far as possible, a poet's environment and the conditions under which he worked, in order to judge his poetry" (p. 47). This last sentence should be kept in mind as the nearest approach that is made toward a definition of what Miss Rinaker means by the historical method. If the claim made for Warton is valid, it is very important indeed. If it is not valid, one feels justified in taking some pains to correct so serious an error.

There is nowhere any indication that these statements are to be understood as applying to English criticism only. Warton is made the founder of this method of criticism for all Europe. Even if the assertions just quoted held good for English criticism alone, as they do not, it would then be necessary to show that they

hold good for Europe at large. For Thomas Warton read European literature and criticism. If there were no other way of proving this, the bibliography which Miss Rinaker has compiled would prove it. Moreover, when it is a question of establishing Warton's claim to the use of a comparative method, Miss Rinaker insists upon his knowledge of Spanish and Italian. Why does she not mention it, at least, in connection with the use of the historical method? This method had been known in Italian criticism for two centuries and had been illustrated in documents with which Warton was certainly familiar, since he quotes from at least one of them, and that one contains the main arguments of the others. All this matter of historical criticism had been worked over in Italy, in a field very similar to that in which Warton was engaged—the controversy over Ariosto, the Italian Spenser, whose relation to the “rules” was very like Spenser's, who was the model for most of Spenser's departures from the rules, and who was justified by his early critics in just the way that Warton was to justify Spenser. Miss Rinaker would have avoided a serious mistake if she had practised the same comparative method which she rightly commends in Warton's criticism.

Among the most emphatic words of Warton quoted by Miss Rinaker in order to support his claim to the discovery of the historical method are those of the well-known sentence from the *Observations*: “It is absurd to think of judging either Ariosto or Spenser by precepts which they did not attend to.” (It may be worthy of notice that neither Warton nor his critic raises the question whether they *should* have attended to these precepts.) Warton then proceeds to show that both Ariosto and Spenser worked in a new genre for which no rules had been laid down. The coupling of Ariosto with Spenser is very significant because it was in connection with the Italian poet that the same things had been said before. In this, as in so much else, Warton follows his lead quite openly and seems, according to modern standards, curiously unconcerned to conceal his indebtedness. For this is precisely what Giovan Battista Pigna and his master, Giraldi Cintio, had said exactly two centuries before, in defending Ariosto. Their opinion was paraphrased by Torquato Tasso in his *Discorso del Poema Eroico*, Lib. Sec., a work cited by Warton in his *History*.² Tasso says: “Il romanzo (così chiamano il Furioso e gli altri simili) è specie di poesia diversa dalla epopeja, e non conosciuta da Aristotele; per questo non è obbligato a quelle regole, che dà Aristotele dell' epopeja. E se dice Aristotele che l'unità della favola è necessaria nell' epopeja, non dice però che si convenga a questa poesia di romanzi non conosciuta da lui.” It is well known that Tasso abides by the rules in his poem, where they do apply,

² My attention has been called to the passages in Tasso and Pigna by Mr. Robert E. Rockwood, A.M., of Columbia University, who will make a detailed study of these relationships in an early publication.

and that he mildly condemns Ariosto for the multiplicity of his fable, but there is no difference in this respect between Tasso and Warton. The passage quoted is given by Tasso as a résumé of the opinions of Ariosto's defenders, but he represents the cardinal doctrines of his opponents with perfect fairness.

Again, Miss Rinaker quotes as evidence of Warton's priority, these words: "In reading the works of a poet who lived in a remote age, it is necessary that we should look back upon the customs and manners which prevailed in that age. We should endeavour to place ourselves in the writer's situation and circumstances. Hence we shall become better enabled to understand how his turn of thinking, and manner of composing, were influenced by familiar appearances and established objects, which are utterly different from those with which we are at present surrounded." (p. 47) To the man who first enunciated and applied this principle, all honor is due, if he can be found, but that man was not Thomas Warton. What essential difference is there between the view just stated and that elaborated by Giraldo Cintio in his *Discorsi intorno al comporre de i Romanzi*, 1554? "Vedonsi anco nell' Odissea d'Homero," he says, "molte cose, et specialmente quand egli fa che Nausicaa, figliuola d'Alcinoo, se ne va al fiume con le altre fantesche a lavar panni, ilche al nostro tempo sarebbe disdicevole, non dirò a figliuola di Signore, o di gentil' huomo, ma di semplice artigiano. Et questa all' hora aveniva perche i Poeti di que primi tempi seguivano una certa loro rozza semplicità, che era lontana da quella Maestà che . . . apparavi poi insieme con l'eccellenza dell' imperio di Roma. . . . Ne quali serebbe gran vitio volere seguitare Homero in quelle cose che come al suo tempo convenivano, così rimasero nella Maestà di Roma sconvenevoli, et similimente sconvenevoli sono ne i nostri tempi." (Pp. 31-32 of the 1554 edition.)

These remarks are important not because they are the only examples of historical criticism before Warton but because they are taken from the very field of Italian criticism with which Warton was most certainly familiar. The same questions were raised, with similar results, in Spain, in connection with the plays of Lope de Vega, who admitted the validity of the rules, like the Italians, like Warton, but said that his plays belonged to a new genre. The controversy of the Ancients and the Moderns, both in France and in England, brought the matter up again and led to many unmistakable pronouncements in favor of the historical point of view and of a relative aesthetic. Such pronouncements are to be found, for example, in Charpentier (*De l'Excellence de la langue française*, 1683, I, ch. 9), in Boileau's *Lettre à Perrault*, 1700), in Fontenelle's *Digressions sur les anciens et les modernes*, 1688, and in the Abbé du Bos's curious anticipation of Taine in studying the influence of geography and climate upon art (*Reflexions sur la poésie et sur la peinture*, 1719). This reference of matters

of taste to climate had been anticipated in Jean Bodin's *Methodus ad facilem historiarum cognitionem*, 1566, which was known to Sidney, Harvey and Bacon. The most familiar treatment of it is in the writings of Montesquieu, which Warton certainly had read.

A few words will make it clear that Warton was preceded in the use of the historical method by Frenchmen. The Abbé de Pons writes in his *Lettre sur l' "Iliade" de La Motte* (1714): "Si l'on fait attention au siècle grossier dans lequel naquit Homère, si l'on a égard aux mœurs rustiques qui régnaient alors, si l'on ne perd pas de vue l'impossibilité morale d'atteindre à la perfection dans un essai hasardé sans le secours des règles et des exemples, on jugera Homère un grand génie, et le premier homme de son siècle rustique, en même temps qu'on jugera son poème très défectueux pour un siècle aussi éclairé que le nôtre."

It will be noticed that the Abbé de Pons does not question the validity of the rules, but this does not disqualify him in the comparison with a critic like Warton, who could say in the opening paragraph of his *Observations* that it was evidence of bad taste in the Academicians della Crusca to prefer the poem of Ariosto to that of Tasso and that it may be urged as an instance of Spenser's weak and undiscerning judgment that he chose to follow Ariosto rather than Tasso, the plan of whose work was much more regular and legitimate than that of his rival.

That the use of the historical method is by no means a certain indication of romantic proclivities is shown in the following words of a man so thoroughly neo-classical as Fenelon: "Les anciens ont un grand avantage: faute de connaître parfaitement leurs mœurs, leur langue, leur goût, leurs idées, nous marchons à tâtons en les critiquant." (*Lettre sur les occupations de l'Académie*, 1716). Above all, it is proved in many a passage of Saint Évremonde, whom no one has ever regarded as a romantic critic. The historic point of view is so pervasive in the writings of the exiled Frenchman that he has been regarded by some, erroneously, as I hope I have shown, as the discoverer of it. His work is so well known and so important in precisely this matter of historical criticism that one is at a loss to understand Miss Rinaker's failure even to mention him. Saint Évremonde's essays and letters were translated into English in 1685-6, forming one of the first extended bodies of criticism from a single pen in the language, and they ran through several editions before Warton's time. His actual contribution to the theory of the historical method is slight but he made that method known to those in England to whom the barriers of language were important and who were unacquainted with the earlier manifestations of the same point of view in their native literature. "Il faut convenir," he says, "que la *Poétique* d'Aristote est un excellent ouvrage: cependant il n'y a rien d'assez parfait pour

régler toutes les nations et tous les siècles.” (*De la tragédie ancienne et moderne*, 1672.) Again he writes: “Nous envisageons la nature autrement que les anciens ne l’ont regardée. Les cieux, cette demeure éternelle de tant de divinités, ne sont qu’un espace immense et fluide. . . . Tout est changé: les dieux, la nature, la politique, les mœurs, le goût, les manières. Tant de changements, n’en produiront-ils point, dans nos ouvrages? Si Homère vivoit presentement, il feroit des poèmes admirables, accommodés au siècle ou il écriroit.” (*Sur les poèmes des anciens*, 1685.)

The admired and influential writings of Saint Évremonde would have domesticated the historical method in England if it had been unknown there before they appeared. That it was known there long before that time, however, Mr. G. M. Miller has sufficiently shown in his dissertation, *The Historical Point of View in English Literary Criticism from 1550-1770*. This study, published in 1911, is defective in several ways and certainly overworks its central thesis, but it should nevertheless have made impossible such assertions regarding Warton’s priority as those under discussion. Avoiding obscure names and considering only those writings which Warton must have known, we find, as indubitable exponents of the historical method, such documents as Samuel Daniel’s *Defence of Rhyme*, 1602; Sir William Temple’s essay *Of Poetry*, 1692; John Dennis’s *Impartial Critick*, 1693; Addison’s *Discourse of Ancient and Modern Learning* (of uncertain date and ascribed to Addison by Hurd); the prefaces to *A Collection of Old Ballads*, 1723 (Lowndes says on the authority of Dr. Farmer that the editor was Ambrose Philips); Thomas Blackwell’s *Enquiry into the Writings of Homer*, 1735.

The use of the historical and comparative methods in Temple’s essay must be familiar to every thorough student of English literature. Like the Abbé du Bos, but before him, he goes to that extreme of relativity which we commonly associate with Montesquieu and Taine, asserting in a famous passage that England’s superiority in humor is due to the freakishness of her climate. John Dennis may be echoing Temple in the words: “To set up the Grecian Method [of criticism] amongst us with success it is absolutely necessary to restore not only their Religion and their Polity, but to transpose us to the same Climate in which Sophocles and Euripides writ.” (Quoted by Miller.) Addison’s *Discourse* makes the point that a work of art has upon contemporaries an effect quite different from that which it is to make upon posterity. He illustrates by saying that a local legend in Virgil was to Virgil’s first readers much what a modern allusion to Arthur or Guy of Warwick is to us. Pigna had said the same thing many years before: “Rinaldo poi Brandimarte & altri paladini sono a guisa di Theseo, di Giasone, & d’altri Heroi, et e la Tavola rotonda come la Naue degli Argonautici.” (*I Romanzi di M. Giovan Battista*

Pigna, 1554. p. 21.) Blackwell's *Homer* ascribes Homer's greatness to a "concourse of natural causes," among which a large body of legend ready to the poet's hand, an "expressive religion," naive customs, picturesque speech, and climate are mentioned. He insists that to understand Homer aright we must keep in mind the ancient modes of recital and reconstruct imaginatively the mood and situation of his audience.

The ease with which these quotations have been gathered would seem to indicate that many more might readily be found. They are sufficiently numerous to show that instead of being a new thing in Warton's time the historical method was almost a commonplace of criticism. They do not show any extended application of the method, and no quotations of reasonable length could show that. Indeed, Miss Rinaker would have been much nearer the truth if, instead of saying that Warton laid "the foundations of modern historical criticism," she had said that he was one of the first to add importantly to the superstructure. In one of the two places where she qualifies her categorical statement, she says that no important results followed from the glimmerings of the method that had visited earlier minds. The present writer is disposed to think that one of the important results of this earlier exposition of the method is to be found in the fact that Warton used it. It was Warton's extraordinary erudition that made his more extensive application possible. By the date of his birth and by his position in life he just escaped the gentlemanly obscurantism, the French hatred of mere learning, which Temple inveighed against and which made impossible for so long anything resembling a parade of learning in polite letters. Then too, Warton's extended use of this point of view was assisted by what Addison and Steele would have called his "master-passion," antiquarianism. Miss Rinaker points out clearly that his "passion for the past" was the key to his entire life. It is no more a wonder than a sin "for a man to labor in his vocation." But the thing that most powerfully assisted Warton was the great increase of interest in history and historiography since the beginning of his century. Professor Courthope thinks that Gray would have done better work than Warton on the *History* and regrets that Warton spent so much time on research rather than upon higher criticism. (*History of English Poetry*, Introduction). This seems a mistake. We feel at once the grotesque wrongness of Bolingbroke in his *Letters on the Study and Use of History*, where he complains of the fact-grubbing methods of contemporary historians. He thinks that all the essential facts have been gathered and that men should now address themselves to the task of arranging them in final literary form. This in 1752! Yet such an attitude was more nearly justifiable toward the history of the time than it would have been toward English poetry. Warton did, wonderfully well on the whole, just the sort of thing that most cried out for a doer.

Miss Rinaker's rather numerous discoveries of new and unprecedented points of view in Warton will surprise even those few of her readers who have in mind none of the facts by which her assertions are to be refuted. For there is the initial improbability that an important critical method should have originated in England, a country which has nearly always followed the lead of France in critical matters—seldom with more docility than during the lifetime of Warton. There is the improbability that the essentially romantic temper of the English mind should have gone without expression throughout the whole period of what we may consider to have been classic domination. One needs to go only to the poetry of Warton's father, which curiously anticipates every important interest and theme in the poetry of the brothers to see that romantic modes of thought and feeling never died out, in England. Finally, there is the improbability which Miss Rinaker, in her anxiety to vindicate her hero at all points, misses altogether,—the improbability that a man of Warton's mind, temper, tastes, and habits will ever do anything surprisingly novel. Warton was, in fact, unusually imitative and "derivative." It is difficult to point out anything that he did or said or wrote for which the model or, at least, the suggestion, does not readily occur to one's mind. The poetry that a man writes ought to be as good an indication as anything of his originality. Warton does not seem to have cared even to appear original in his verse. His early work is often almost a mosaic of phrases from Milton and in his later poetry he partially transfers allegiance to Gray. There is little likelihood that he thought of this as plagiarism, though he could be sarcastic about Pope's appropriations from those very poems from which he himself drew so largely—the minor poems of Milton. The probability is that in this matter also Warton effected an unconscious compromise between neo-classic and romantic standards. He retained the old doctrine of imitation but imitated a modern model. It is not only the phrase but the metrics and the themes of his models that he imitates. His ruins, graves, rivers, solitudes, were threadbare themes—dear to him for that very reason. Samuel Johnson went unerringly to the point in one line, at least, of his versified comment on Warton—"All is strange, yet nothing new." And this need not detract from the real, though very mild, charm of Warton's verse to one who does not share in the modern romantic craving for mere novelty in art. It is mentioned only as an index to Warton's type of mind, which was in all important respects "lunar," and not "solar."

Miss Rinaker is convinced that Warton was a revolter from the classic age. "Warton's revolt against the classic age," she says, "is nowhere more apparent than in the stand he took for imagination and spontaneity as the essential qualities of poetry, and

against reason and artificiality as its corrupters" (p. 94). Then let us try out the question of Warton's "revolt" on just this ground where Miss Rinaker says it is most apparent. In the *Observations on the Faerie Queene* Warton writes: "Nothing is more absurd or useless than the panegyric comments of those, who criticise from the imagination rather than from the judgment, who exert their admiration instead of their reason, and discover more of enthusiasm than discernment." Never, surely, was there a milder revolutionist, never a more tender iconoclast or a more rational antagonist of reason. The fact is that in matters critical Warton was a compromiser, a balancer of old and new. In other things he was positively reactionary. Revolt simply was not in him. And just because he argued for reason as well as for imagination, just because he saw that reason is not, as Miss Rinaker implies it is, the corrupter of poetry, he will seem to many a far larger and better man than his most impassioned apologist, "discovering more enthusiasm than discernment," has made him out to be.

ODELL SHEPARD.

Harvard University.

THE LIFE AND ROMANCES OF MRS. ELIZA HAYWOOD.

By George Frisbie Whicher, Ph. D., Columbia University Press, 1915, pp. xi+210.

Although Mrs. Haywood was once read and admired by a large public, unfortunately for her memory the most certain of her claims to immortality is the malodorous treatment given her by Pope. Even the wasp of Twickenham outdid himself in malignity and obscenity in that passage of the *Dunciad* beginning,

See in the circle next, *Eliza* placed.

Whatever additional recollection the ordinary reader has of Mrs. Haywood is probably due to Scott's sarcastic dismissal of the "whole Jemmy and Jenny Jessamy tribe", and the similar contempt of Coleridge and Thackeray for "Jemmy Jessamy stuff." Along with the vast bulk of her work, which is deservedly forgotten, have gone also the *Female Spectator* and a few other pieces worthy of a somewhat better fate.

The task of striking a balance between the estimate of her contemporary followers and the permanent value of her work is beset with peculiar dangers. The specialist is likely to lose his sense of proportion and assign to the subject of his investigation undue importance. Into this fault there is slight danger of Dr. Whicher's falling: he is saved by a keen sense of humor, which, along with other agreeable qualities of style, makes his book delightful reading. If he fails at all in the way of justice, he